REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 7 and 12 are currently being amended.

Claims 17-19 are currently being added.

This amendment and reply adds and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After adding and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-19 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,630,056 to Horvath et al. in view of EP Publication No. 0747803 to Meyers et al. This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claim 1 now recites, among other things:

> *wherein each of said reception interface sections includes a communication error processing section which, upon occurrence of an error in said received data by one of said reception interface sections, stops receiving said data, sends a communication error signal to all other of said reception interface sections to stop data reception from said data sender, and requests said data sender to resend data,*
> *wherein each of said reception interface sections includes an arithmetic operation unit, an I/O unit, and a memory bridge that provides data from said arithmetic operation unit to said I/O unit of the respective reception interface section,*
> *wherein said error in said received data is detected by said memory bridge of said one of said reception interface sections, and*
> *wherein said memory bridge of said one of said reception interface sections sends the communication error signal to said other memory bridges of said other reception interface sections.*

Turning now to the cited art of record, Horvath teaches parallel processing, which enables concurrently processing information received from a data source (in this case a bus). The parallel processing can provide identical processing of data. However, Horvath does not teach or suggest a plurality of reception interface sections that each includes *an* arithmetic operation unit, an I/O unit, and a memory bridge that provides data from said arithmetic operation unit to said I/O unit of the respective reception interface section. Further, Horvath does not teach or suggest that an error in the received data is detected by the memory bridge of one of reception interface sections, and that the memory bridge that detected the communication error notifies the memory bridges of the other reception interface sections of the communication error.

Meyers is cited in the Office Action to allegedly teach the sending of a communication error signal to other reception interface sections to stop data reception from a data sender. Whether or not this is the case, Meyers does not teach or suggest that a memory bridge of one reception interface section notifies the memory bridges of the other reception interface sections of the communication error. Rather, a state machine of one interfaced unit 24a notifies another interface unit 24b of a lost sync error signal, whereby a state machine clearly does not correspond in any way, shape or form to a memory bridge that provides data from an arithmetic operation unit to an I/O unit of a reception interface unit.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 1, as well as presently pendign independent claims 7 and 12 that have been amended in a similar manner, are patentable over the cited art of record.

New Claims:

New claims 17-19 have been added to recite features of how the communication error signal is sent from one memory bridge to the other memory bridges, as described, for example, on page 9, lines 3-4 of the specification. Such features provide an additional basis of patentability for these new claims, beyond the reasons given above for their respective base claim.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date ___January 7, 2009___   By _____

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP   George C. Beck
Customer Number: 22428   Registration No. 38,072
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399   Phillip J. Articola
                                             Registration No. 38,819

-9-